

Oct 31, 1954.

Memorandum on conversation 10/30 with Clifford Grobstein

He finds induction through thin membranes provided donor and recipient are both present. Donor cells fuse (protein + polysaccharide) on filters if fixed first, but not if stripped off first. Supernates, etc. are ineffective. Discussed in terms of "matrix organization".

Abrown's idea - to try similar setup with F^+ / F^- . (use ultra-thin filters).

He brought up anephric mutants. Is spinal cord from these potent? [He took for granted that mesenchyme would be competent].

Buggs was interested in suggestion to use Zentgraf's method to "phase" development.

Had long discussion about tumor cell genetics. (Should see how on this later).

OFFICE MEMORANDUM • STANFORD UNIVERSITY

DATE:

To : J. L.

FROM :

4/1/59.

SUBJECT: Conversation ~~Date~~ With Clifford Grobstein

(1) Use vibrating wire to sever connections between donor and recipient cells.

(2) Equivalence of inducer with T antigen.

(3) Use of specific sero types and iso-antibodies as means of discriminating action of donor and recipient cells. This is something to discuss with Nossal or Makela.

10/4/58.

Program for receptor analysis.

- (a) assay of receptor - competition by extracts?
- (b) periodate effect.
- (c) measure of fidelity with periodate?
- (d) other enzymes? - select some? Lysosome presumably does not destroy receptor (Isoucaine functioning as a monovalent cation? rather than chelator)
- (e) chemical analysis of σ^+ , g cells.

7/26/53.

Summarize hang-overs (over trip West ca 7/28-8/25)

A. Salmonella. (?? Brunstetter).

1. Abortus-equi
2. Para A (write to Spilner re I).
3. Other ϕ 's, groups: kumpudof/22; Cherryphage to tetra; BAAK.
(Andy) double lysogenic.
4. H(H₁) Fla, F₁, ... linkage problems.
5. Phase variability
 - a. UV m N97 ph2.
 - b. phase "exhaustion"?
6. SW1061 (cf. 1051 Q, R.) - v1050. LI-2
6. Gal pseudo-alleles to screen for GalV? LT7: 481-4 492-5 503-6
LT2: 950 LT22: 307, 8; 485-6.
7. O crosses.

B. E. coli

1. Cytology (assistant?)
2. Hfr Gal SR+ photo; constant diploids. Revenir Tom's stuff.
3. misc. Gal hp... Nord^R other media not yet located? stl?
4. Revenir data on Gal cloning; correlat. \pm Mal cloning? WSP3 line 945?
5. Brunstetter to Cavalli (for x Hfr?)
6. Weed stuff.
7. (2284 x)
8. Secondary diploid \rightarrow Revenir zygotes?
9. Transduction of Hfr.
10. Recover Mal- WSP5, etc from diploids. Use stl-?
11. Summary of pedigree segregation data!

Oct 4 1958. 1428-30. Hybrid program and stores.

Wanted well defined Arg , Gal Hfr stores. But, as shown by HFT tests and Hfr crosses, the only well-typed culture maybe W4270 = Gal_2 .

1430_A shows some preliminary crosses of Hfr $Arg_3 Gal_2 \times Arg_2 Gal_1$
W4270 \times W4308 on $MArg$, $MGal$.

a rather low yield of Arg^+ and Gal^+ have been selected. But none of these are v.v.

(1430_C) is trial of W4276 = Arg_4 Hfr purportedly Gal_2 .

But in crossing tests (cf. \times W4265, W4308) it behaves as Gal_1 .

It is also rather poorly fertile. (maybe no longer Hfr.) Ais line was to isolate an Arg_2/Arg_1 heterozygote for proof of position effect. Review of 1430A this seems futile. Maybe better to use Lac selection for this and forget about Gal . Poor fertility provided chelation, nutrition and microenvironment manipulated M mutation in the line.

1430B — Miscellaneous crossing tests. Did also isolate 1430B3e:

W4308 \times W4273 : $Gal^+ Arg^+$ (Arg_2/Arg_3)

W4283 \times $\begin{matrix} 4069 \\ 4062 \end{matrix}$ } both Arg^+ \therefore $\frac{c}{\neq} Arg_5 = 1$
 $Arg_4 = 2.$

Some confusion due to W4178 really being Hfr.

10/3/58

(cann/EAL)

□ I L priorities

SAL

Salmonella problems:

spontaneous appearance of arg^- among prototrophic parents?

homology of arg mutants. (use Hfr arg testers)

homology of gal mutants - of gal_1 , gal_2 differences:
and diploid production in
colonies.

□ 2 W1895 x SW1231 \rightarrow Hfr? and $gal^+ lac^-$.
 { 2345 gal_1 }
 { 3013 gal_2 } \rightarrow $lac^+ arg^+ \lambda 2^s$ P22^R gal^+ can't test for

□ 1 production of more markers in SW1214 = TM9. Can best
use multimarker as F^- to allow better testing of δ^+ character.
 $arg - gal - arg$.

odd ideas:

periodated cells as F^- ; acidine orange-treated.

select maximum reactivity Hfr types

infective factors controlling *Salmonella* fertility (+ or -).

4/14/56. Resume analysis of chain pedigrees. Interrupted last July.

Where are former précis? Where is summary index to Salmonella?

Monday April 23, 1956. I have long felt the need for more systematic, integrative summaries of current work. Rather than leave general notes scattered or under subject headings, they can be listed here and indexed by subject. For system, I intend to write on this heading each Monday. The following headings are proposed.

[LAB : current experiments & immediate plans; writing; etc.; visits & travel.
Other activity: notions books home & personal.]

[Main preoccupation is again assimilating notes on "chain" for paper. Bone had sent me his manuscript draft. This has been hanging fire since Jan 1955 and has been almost a millstone (cf. consp.) I don't have any real difficulties: Bone exc. my data do not exclude alternative hypotheses of E-particle. It is a horror trying to collate the various pedigrees, each is an individual event. I had started this before, but decided to do it over again to be better organized. It is a little hard to get down to this every day because of ridiculously small details to attend to. EG: today talked to electrician to get dryers installed. Also asked me to write to Kibabawa re F/G. Letters to Edwards (re his trip); Pontecorvo, do.; Barnes (Havell, re set/mouse chemists) June re errors in our ms.; Breadly to see vegetation → aerial hyphae; Larry Mase down to Railway type. I went to help cart home lounge for our home office. Lunches: Eothen + Jim Crow; repair ohm-meter for electrician to use; if possible re spectrophotometer circuit; c. 2 hours on wording for Bristol; + OCG on current isolation & preparing some cultures to ship out; Newton on vitreousness alleles; phone calls to student employment (for home help) to Woroch re airconditioning lab; from Harold Deutsch re Gordin & Tordin visit; Boris brought in his ms. on sonic effects. So today I haven't actually gotten to my own notes. Johnson re penicillins.

Experimentally a) S-former Penicillin in 20% sucrose broth induces rd → sphere transformation in K-12 strains. Guess c. 1/3 lysed 1/3 spheres. See 1310 for current status & what needs to be done. Prospects are: development of L-cycle (use protein in agar media?); prep of DNA for -x; spheres highly permeable? x-; (for Boris - effects of enzymes on the spheres, e.g. proteolysis - Brenner, Spiegelman); (for Johnson - mechanisms of action of penicillin).

This work has been a casual development, largely motivated by Dennis last paper (JBast) and a hunch that protoplasts are related to L-forms. Weibull showed stability of ~~the~~ protoplasts in sucrose; Dennis et al that penicillin induced protoplasts + he often uses high salt to maintain them! Should check his paper for improvement of medium.

b) — see 1292 - Analysis of Hfr. To do a upper test of possible non eliminators and to set these up in pair analysis: W2401 ("g").

OCG is doing most routine work to @ secure h^+ , Gal⁻ derivatives and F^- and mot-Hfr. The F^- will be tested x Hfr-1, and after F^- x F^- for other evidence of chromosome rearrangement.

Have suspended diploid studies, cf. H406. — EML is screening this one. May prefer to use new Hfr's in further work.

When writing obligations are over, review angles of 1290 fl on Hfr selection techniques etc. But current resolution: do one thing at a time, at least till routine is fully settled + new essts. are broken in.

— Notes — see Bast record re phobing, antighucose. Any literature?

At present time, "Mae" Wright has retired; two undergraduates (M. Lee and Kitty von Rybickiz) have been working parttime in making up media. OCG still supervises them & spends a little time on my own programs.

KM is working on loc allelism, following up lines of EML's thesis with help of new techniques (Hfr crossing; later on, phage-transduction) latest finding today: interesting allelism of W3133; W3134; W1941. Possible screening? are the "+" recombinants or diploids?

Home - major preoccupation is planting in garden: anticipate major job on trees this Friday. Finally this summer 2 to some shade. Yesterday, reported me old black breast shrimp. My achy back! Trying second one by barrowing out. Hasn't worked so far!

Blas: Tubby; Pico Revol.
Prinster: ~~the~~ low water high level.
Blumenthal - Bohman's Budlom
Dreining - Ameyo.

Theater: Magisterium Salzburg
Pajama Game (NY road co.)

APR 24 1956

APR 24 1958 "Bacterial Metonymy" just came in mail. Weibull especially seems to value the correspondence of protoplasts with L-forms; most people are concentrating on growth positions. After checking Dienes (2/53 J/Bact) and Kawabuchi (A.R.) it is obvious they have but one penicillin + conc. salt which is counterpart of p+sucrose. So will compare a balanced conc. salt (at c. M/2 which > Kawabuchi's) with sucrose penicillin. Obvious field for further culturing is use of protein-agar. (Dienes anaerobic may mean humid?). Note both Dienes & Kaw. emphasize cultivation of L-forms, rather than initial R \rightarrow S transformation, but Dienes must have this in mind also.

Strategy: what first. Main pending issues are ① charlie paper ②
Hfr types ③ S-forms. Must do one thing at a time. Only means for pressure on
③ is "the computer" which is poor tactics (to waste your own time to scoop another
fellow rather than have him do your work.) \therefore continue only casual study on ④
4 focus on ②, complete ①!

phloerjins : checked some literature (esp McKee Physiol Rev 1945) —
in mechanosis all is chaos: should be very productive avenue for
Bustal but not obvious where bacteria come in.

The first question is whether the effect of the hormone is direct or indirect. It is direct if the hormone acts on the target cells without the need for a second messenger. It is indirect if the hormone acts through a second messenger. The second question is whether the effect is reversible or irreversible. The third question is whether the effect is specific or non-specific. The fourth question is whether the effect is acute or chronic. The fifth question is whether the effect is local or systemic. The sixth question is whether the effect is physiological or pathological. The seventh question is whether the effect is beneficial or harmful. The eighth question is whether the effect is desirable or undesirable. The ninth question is whether the effect is predictable or unpredictable. The tenth question is whether the effect is controllable or uncontrollable.

different.
position-effect group; we have to send them (2) and (3) to see if there are in any way
about the conclusivity of the entire separation myself. - anyway, these minutes from the
Warner took a phone call from Herman yesterday which sounded rather confused. I don't under-
stand the 1-phosphate group, which is the same as the subject as in insects.
Note from Kishner and Kurshanski: Del 1.5 and 1.6 and 1.7 - definitely all back and forth and

In the lab only one new point: the effect of GA in stabilizing expression of K-12 was confirmed. It now remains to 1) review viability of these groups; 2) biochemical properties—how to grow them out to T47, including growing on non-lambda transduction.

APR 26 1956

Tues. MAY 1 1956 Net (+) last week practically nil. A negligible amount of work on paper (19); was much preoccupied with planting trees & shrubs this last week. E.C.: put in 6 red pines all yesterday. As it rained heavily over the weekend & still waiting for birches and honey locust for shade in front. After a very droughty last year & winter, we suddenly had 3" of rain last week.

Also a lot of time on arrangements for Pontecorvo lecture next week, with calls from TMS and him re safe on Bloomington timing.

Bob Briggs was visiting from Wednesday P.M. which also took some time but was well worth it. He gave 2 talks on his nuclear transplantations, and we also spent a lot of time together, as he stayed over with us through Saturday P.M. He talked about the R-S effects with penicillin & the stabilizations by Ca, which seemed to interest him particularly for analogy

with preserving nuclear function. One of the more exciting co-stimuli was about centrioles considered for plasmids, which came up obliquely in discussing various experimental designs/ in re nuclear transplantations. I had not realized how sharply dependent the frog egg was on a sperm "or center", having thought that pricking would activate cleavage as well as the initial fertilization reaction. But Bob had seen that experiments involving, e.g., blood as a reagent did not exclude centrioles; this is of course the answer to Shaver's problem of the "second factor" in parthenogenesis; Briggs was sceptical about the extent of any of the activations with ill-defined material, as Shaver did not score his material very late, and his yields were very low. What excited me was that the activated unfertilized egg would constitute a simple assay for the biological activity of centriolar preparations, qua plasmid, with all the possibilities for genetic and chemical analysis. They already know that Triturus irradiated sperm will activate frog eggs, so the specificities are low; it is even conceivable that mouse centrioles will function in frog cytoplasm if any of Shaver is to be relevant here. Anyhow we did converge on the importance of this, and Bob may put a fellow "Subtelny" to the problem of pulling apart sperm, and perhaps other cells, to define just what the activating center is. I would almost be tempted to take a vacation in Philadelphia myself.

Note from Kalckar and Kurahashi: Gal 1, 6 and 7 evidently all lack the second enzyme, galactose-1-phosphate-uridyl transferase, which is the same as the galactosemic infants. Esther took a phone call from Herman yesterday which sounded rather confused; I don't understand the constitutivity of the enzyme sequence myself. Anyhow, these mutants form one position-effect group; we have to send them Gal₂ and Gal₃ to see if these are in any way different.

In the lab only one new point: the effect of Ca in stabilizing spheres of K-12 was confirmed; it now remains to 1) review viability of these preps.; 2) biochemical properties— per Boris, and 3) try to grow them out. So far, nothing promising on non-lambda transduction. as L forms.

MAY 1 1956

Ctd Brink has had some remarkable findings lately with \bar{M} and R^{st} . In crosses of $rr \times R-$, the Rr progeny differ depending on whether the $-$ was R^{st} . The differences persist another generation of selfing! There are similar differences in $R^{st} \times R-$! Brink evidently concludes that R is modified by contact with R^{st} at meiosis, but the modification is maintained in Rr , lost in RR . (How about $R'R'$, where $'$ stands for the modification). Until the heritability had been shown, I had argued that there was some sort of paternal carryover effect on the endosperm phenotype, not necessarily at the R locus itself. As a further alternative, R^{st} may carry an plasmid which cannot be maintained in RR , but is transmitted through both sexes. The test of this is $R^{st}r \times RR$, examining the Rr 's for an affect via the r . This may have to be carried another generation too; this does not necessarily prove cytoplasm, only that $'$ can be carried in series from Rst to r to R .

Current irritation: the degradation of "locus" from a precise recombinational definition to a loose "functional" unit (per Demerec, Pritchard & Pontecorve, ^{Wings}). Also note that Hotchkiss has turned tables, and discusses "Transduction- a phage mediated transformation" in "Nucleic Acids". This is not so bad; the main point in the taxonomy, not the nomenclature. But suppose Griffith's observation had not been a typical transduction (which was not known or realized for 20 years)?

May 13, 1956 (Sun)/ Pontecorvo visited last week, arriving several hours late owing to fog, and only just in time to meet us at the Hoffman House for a dinner honoring Jim Neel by a local medical student fraternity. But we had tickets to the Dublin Players, to which Ponte¹ escorted Ann Crow to see Arms and the Man, rather than Neel's lecture on hemoglobins. Neel himself is in the midst of a changeover to a Genetics Department at U/Mich Medical School. He still construes this rather narrowly as human genetics (my own hopes would be for a department having the same relationship to medicine as ours does to Agriculture.). For example, he had projected some tissue cultures studies on human mutant material, but for biochemical rather than any hope of genetic analysis. We discussed Newton Morton's position at the medical school here; Jim had also talked to Mortenson, and I fear there is a growing misunderstanding on Newton's role in Anatomy. (I also ran into Phil Cohen whose apprehensions are even stronger, and he is going to reopen the question with Bowers. Newt¹ himself doesn't seem to be strong enough to stand up to these pressures, and he is especially vulnerable just because his research program is in abeyance while he learns laboratory genetics.) It's too bad we don't have a stronger start (in add. to, not in place of Newton-- I just thought of Mitchison as representative of some of the other hopeful directions. This did not just come from the blue; Ponte¹ told me that Mitch had just done the experiment on degregation of cells heterozygous for H_2 which I talked about at the Ascites meeting, and which I suppose G Klein had also planned.

We had an intensive going-over with Ponte, after which I feel rather pumped dry though this is largely my own impulse. It must still be barely possible to do some mapping from diploid automixis in coli, but the worst problem is breaking into the cycle of circular reasoning on the location of markers. This has been something I had hoped to find the right student for, but he hasn't materialized, and Alan seems less likely than at first. I don't really have much worthwhile data, but now that Gal₅ is out of the stocks, and we can score Lac₁ vs Lac₂ fairly readily by progeny tests, the problem should be simpler. The best designs at first might be to select for crossing-over of near-linked genes. For example, between Lac_{1,4} and V₆, selecting for V₆⁺ still Lac⁻, or between Lac_{1,4}, or between

Mal and S (+s/-r, selecting for +r/-r) and seeing the distribution of homozygotes for other markers. But we need the right marked diploids first, and these may just now be coming through from Lac₄Hfr x Lac₁ crosses, the stocks for which are a by-product of Newton's work.

Experimentally, last week was only a couple of days between visitors (MTW) which concerned mainly more on "protoplasts" (I like Stahelin's term gymnoplasts better). The experiments were rather messy, probably because of haste, and perhaps because summer started abruptly with some muggy 80+ weather. (At least the planting is essentially done now). Viability has been variable, some preps showing at least 50%; others less than 5. No show so far on an L cycle, but haven't tried hard enough yet. It is certain that the protoplasts do make NPGase, but even the control rods are not too happy about the hypertonic sucrose, and it may take some more fiddling with the medium to perfect that, if at all. No more trials yet on DNA --x; it would be exciting to be able to isolate nuclei cleanly fast (as Sol claims he can with megaterium). I have to review my plans carefully on the whole story, to avoid digging too far into details that will be done over anyhow by all and sundry. For example, it is probably pointless to include controls on NPGase synthesis by rods, which are hardly comparable even in mass assay. Meanwhile, Doty is pushing some of the routine preparations for study of the Hfrs, e.g., getting motile, F⁻, Ip⁺ and Gal selections.

Occurred to me while distracted during Ponte's lecture yesterday (I think most of my imaginative thinking happens when I am paying fairly strong attention to something else, including conversation, often on seemingly irrelevant subjects): I had already planned to test the fertility reactions of Hfr and of F⁻ protoplasts performed.

If there is a conjugal bridge, however, pairs might be isolated to penicillin medium, and there show full fusion owing to the derigidification of the cell wall. Then, if the co-spheres are viable, we would have started with a fairly certain dikaryon. This would be almost the opposite of Jacob's experiment.

cf '53

I was beginning to feel fairly relaxed, even with two meetings this summer (Baltimore and Ann Arbor) and the possibility of Esther's leaving for Tokyo, when I had an invitation from Demerec to attend the GSH show. I don't know what to decide about that; I don't particularly want to hear so many papers, and will see most of the people elsewhere. The conceivable pros are: 1) embarrassment at refusing again (with the suspicion that this may be Demerec's intention); 2) possible checkrein on fancies of Demerec; Hayes et al (from a position of disadvantage, and probably futile anyhow 3) it will probably be too damn hot to work here anyhow, and Esther thinks it may be pleasant there 4) chance for sidetrip to Baltimore-Bethesda for talks with Law, Kalckar, etc. Contras: too damn many meetings already—talk talk; expense and time needed to bridge the meetings, and the composure that goes with it.

MAY 25 1956

As above, eventually decided contra.

We had a delightful experience last weekend at the Illinois SIB in Chicago. We drove down Saturday noon arriving at the Edgewater Beach Hotel at 2:30 PM. For about 10 AM. I was helping by the register for the Jewish Daily Forward — he wanted to know what bacteria were and why, and where I isolated E coli &c. I couldn't make him understand what "genes" meant. Some of the other newspaper people have been little better. Pubois Thursday, a Miss Hamblin from Life was in the office but I gathered she wanted to do a "human interest" story on a "typical scientist" — no encouragement! The press agency on all this has been a pain but it should have blown over by now. We arrived in midst of a notoriously dull business meeting, followed by a "symposium" chaired by Agnes Norris and "dedicated to the deadlings" — evidently Louis's idea, partly spoof & partly very touching gesture. Speakers: St Koch, Lerner, Fu, Levinthal, Lehdyson & Bogard & rather entertaining. I made a point of getting a little closer to Lerner. Carl was silly — along lines of his recent Science article, but I had to agree with him in principle: why not, if but subtle-induced mutations?!

Dinner covered mostly Gussler who was presiding & turned out to be an excellent M.C. Tell news about prototypes but will have to send Sol a copy of note this week, (just written = 46). Gussler made things rather pleasant: I was rather terrified by a very mixed audience & having to follow the symposium but talked loosely briefly about "genes" — i.e. the pen on genes — bacteria — development & the subgenity of viruses & genes (translocation of genes; segregation of viruses). Half no idea but went off. Night & next day at Swanson's & met R C / dry & ux. for dinner, then drove home Sunday nt.

Thursday visits with

Sheldon Rosenberg, now at ~~University of~~

Am. Poly. (can't remember), to learn

missionary pilot.

Jan 2, 1956 (Sat.) Mess EVDZ. Rolling the ball up Thursday for
highly interested about the new in public relations. My correspondence
is about 100% complete. The security of his ideas
My correspondence c. These dates comes the matter, but I lost most
of Thursday writing same. I hope Novt' comes to his senses: will
describe visits here & really do feel guilty (in a mischievous
fashion actually) for not having talked to Sol.

Sam Novick will have received formal invitation to join
Zobzy faculty as assoc. professor, he's rather diffident but
may come, as I hope to.

MAY 25 1956

This week have been completed details on background of protoplasts & wrote up a survey for PR/AS. Now that's over I am concentrating on the genetic applications & let Norton & Sol et al. go into the enzymology of their work. This is now a turning point and important to decide carefully what to do. See analysis of situation infra.

Salmonella

Conclude that it is wasteful to spend more time on chem's.
 should learn to control wetting of slides & perhaps (more) mic
 methods though dubious!

To finish ① Review notes on phages

② " " " H⁺/Fla segregation! More tests for
 crosson Fla⁻'s?

③ Any more isolations?

④ Pictures.

⑤ Pick up cells for EM? Will need technique for coli/salmonella.

⑥ Notebook analysis will doubtless suggest more.

[Ino] - go over extant Fla⁻ for the linkage! of coli/Salmonella mutants
 microscopically

WRITING! Amburst - Chemis - BOOK - Best Rev?
 Misc. papers.

MLM!!!